

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 316 462

SO 020 534

AUTHOR Turner, Mary Jane
TITLE Education for Democracy in the United States: Post Sputnik to 1970.
PUB DATE 30 Sep 89
NOTE 25p.; Paper presented at the Conference on the Development of Democracy after World War II (Federal Republic of Germany, September 24-30, 1989).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Citizenship Education; *Civics; Curriculum Development; *Democracy; *Educational Change; Educational History; *Educational Trends; Instructional Materials; Material Development; Political Attitudes; Political Science; Secondary Education; Social Studies

ABSTRACT

It is difficult to attempt to assess citizenship and political education in the United States over time or even at one point in time. The country is huge, culturally and politically diverse, and educational decision making is highly decentralized. Thus, to determine exactly what is being taught in the name of political education is not easy. Social studies has traditionally been assigned the responsibility for teaching citizenship, but not all social studies professionals agree about how to achieve this grand purpose. The goals, content, and methodology of political education in the United States are equally diffuse and complex. Because of the complexities inherent in the topic, this paper examined a limited set of issues: (1) who or what was considered a good citizen in the 1960s; (2) dominant course patterns in the schools; (3) criticisms of education leading to reform; (4) political education in the new social studies; and (5) the reactions, impact, and utilization of the new materials. The analysis focused primarily on secondary-level instruction. Four tables are included. (JB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

"EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES:
POST SPUTNIK TO 1970"

by
Dr. Mary Jane Turner
Director
Civic Achievement Award Program
Close Up Foundation

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

MARY JANE
TURNER

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Prepared for Conference
in the Federal Republic of Germany
September 24 - September 30, 1989

SO 020534

EDUCATING FOR DEMOCRACY IN THE UNITED STATES:
POST SPUTNIK TO 1970

INTRODUCTION

It is both a risky and an expansive task to attempt to assess citizenship/political education in the United States over time or even at one point in time. The first problem one faces is that the country is huge, culturally and politically diverse, and educational decision making is highly decentralized, involving over 15,000 school boards and the administrators and teaching staffs associated with them. There are approximately 35 million students enrolled in kindergarten through grade 12 schools at any one time. Thus, to determine exactly what is being taught in the name of political education is not easy.

The difficulties that arise from the size of the country and diversity of local school districts are compounded by the locus or place in the general education curriculum that has traditionally been assigned major responsibility for teaching about what it means to be a citizen. The general public supports this as a goal for social studies as probably do a majority of teachers. Not all social studies professionals agree, however, about how to achieve this grand purpose. Others are not sure that it even makes sense to define so rich and integrative a field as social studies for understanding human behavior simply in terms of citizenship transmission. Barr, Barth, and Shermis in their analysis of the field, Defining the Social Studies, point out:

Social Studies has been defined by some as simplified social science; others have defended the social studies as being a fusion or integration of the social sciences. Some have believed that the social studies are the social sciences, and have chosen to use the term 'social science education.' There have always been those who see social studies as the study of history; there are also others who would abolish history from the social studies. Others, of course, have staunchly defended the social studies as instruction in patriotism and value inculcation, but there have likewise been those who have demanded value neutrality and scientific objectivity. In recent years some educators have argued that the social studies is a unique discipline, or at least an emerging discipline, concerned with the process of thinking, decision making, value analysis, and inquiry skills. There is, in fact, no agreement over whether or not the term 'social studies' is singular or plural.¹

The concern about definition for the social studies was not a phenomenon arising in the 1970s. As early as 1935, Rolla Tyron said:

No one to date...has ever been able to explain how the same

expression [i.e., social studies] can legitimately have two meanings that are exactly the opposite.²

If social studies education is difficult to define with precision, the goals, content, and methodology of political education in the United States are as equally diffuse and complex. Indeed, a historical analysis of textbooks, state department curriculum guidelines, academic and professional association pronouncements, or the ideas of private citizens demonstrate that there is little agreement on even the basic question of whether citizenship education means the education of citizens or education for citizenship.³

Because of the complexities inherent in the topic, we will attempt in this paper to simplify, while at the same time trying not to be simplistic, by examining only a limited set of issues. These are: (1) Who or What was Considered a Good Citizen in the 1960s, (2) Dominant Course Patterns in the Schools, (3) Criticisms of Education Leading to Reform, (4) Political Education in the New Social Studies, (5) Reactions, Impact, and Utilization of the New Materials. In addition, the analysis focuses primarily on secondary-level instruction.

Who or What Was a Good Citizen?

Schools during the 1960s spent an inordinate amount of time, as they do today, training "good citizens." Beyond the notion that they should vote, there was not then, nor is there today, much agreement about what constitutes a good citizen or exactly what attributes a good citizen should have. A special committee of the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) listed the following as defining characteristics in 1951:

A good citizen treats all men with respect, regardless of their station in life; rejects distinctions based on race, creed, or class; exerts his influence to secure equal opportunity for all...; upholds the principle that all men are equal before the law...; believes that the right to vote should not be denied on the basis of race, sex, creed, or economic status; values, respects, and defends basic human rights and privileges guaranteed by the United States Constitution.⁴

A later "authoritative" statement--authoritative because it emerged from the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education--is the compendium of Citizenship Objectives, which was produced in 1969. The Committee, composed of prominent educators and lay representatives, sought to develop objectives in many educational areas, including citizenship. The various objectives, plus the assessments, were intended to:

furnish information to all those interested in American education regarding the educational achievements of our children, youth, and young adults, indicating both the progress we are making and the problems we face.⁵

Citizenship Objectives identifies and develops the following ten broad goals. Citizens should:

1. Show concern for the welfare and dignity of others.
2. Support rights and freedoms of all individuals.

3. Help maintain law and order.
4. Know the main structure and functions of our government.
5. Seek community involvement through active, democratic participation.
6. Understand problems of international relations.
7. Support rationality in communication, thought, and action on social problems.
8. Take responsibility for own personal development and obligations.
9. Help and respect their own families (ages 9, 13, 17).
10. Nurture the development of their children as future citizens (adults).

Each of the broad goals is buttressed by subgoals, which refer particularly to the four age groups selected for examination: 9, 13, 17, and adults.⁶

Many observers have pointed out that the Objectives were based on adult, white, middle-class ethical standards. Operationalizing them, thus, is more a process of knowing and recognizing a priori truths than understanding, analyzing, or evaluating conflicting value positions. The fourth and fifth objectives, for example, seem to seek to legitimize the classical textbook approach to the study of governments.

Farnen and Bjork note that:

descriptions of such a person [good citizen] range from one who is rabidly patriotic to one who is reasonably loyal, from the avid nationalist to the mature cosmopolitan, from the mannered conformist to the creative individualist, and so on. In this respect some definitions stress health, cleanliness, posture, and in one case, even 'the maintenance of good bodily elimination habits.'⁷

One must assume that short hair was also among the criteria defining citizenship during this period. In any event, the "good" citizen seemed to be something of an idealized type whose civic behavior was to be in accordance with a set of values preferred by those who develop the construct.

Dominant Course Patterns in the Schools in the 1960s

In addition to focusing on characteristics the good citizen was supposed to have, it should also be useful to consider the prevalent curriculum rationales that buttressed the various definitions of citizenship. For example, one widely held professional and public definition was that citizenship equated with worthy membership in American society. This view supports the idea that the ways in which one produces, consumes, interacts in groups, raises a family, and so on have significant implications for the society.

Thus, any curriculum which contributes to the physical, emotional, social, or moral development of youth contributes directly to the welfare of the community and should be considered education for democratic citizenship.⁸

According to the model, all education in large measure, could be considered citizenship education.

A second definition emphasized only the political aspects of citizenship, and suggested that the major objective of citizenship education should be developing those abilities necessary to participate in a democratic society. It argued that

a democratic populace must comprehend and appreciate the political character of their society, its goals and objectives, its limitations, its methods of operation, and the boundaries of reasonable choice in their nation and in the international community.⁹

The third rationale is similar to the second in that it had as a major objective the development of participatory skills and zeal. Additionally, this view held that youth should be prepared to adjust to rapid social change through federal, state, and community political institutions. This rationale challenged the traditionally held view that cultural heritage is best transmitted by emphasizing only the positive aspects of our historical development. Students are informed of inequities and inconsistencies so they can be better prepared to find solutions to those negative characteristics.

The first view of citizenship education seems to have been the most prevalent in America in the 1960s and estimates of time spent on this type of citizenship instruction range upward to nearly 50 percent of the entire elementary and secondary educational experience. This figure is reached when one considers that all of the instruction in social studies and a considerable portion in English, mathematics, health, physical education, and even in the sciences had strong citizenship components.¹⁰

One study has concluded that there was more exposure to political education in classrooms in the United States than there was in classrooms in the U.S.S.R. In the United States in grades five through 12, total exposure to political education was 46 percent, compared to 38 percent in the Soviet Union. In grades five through eight, social studies, language arts, extracurricular and homeroom activities had a political component 50 percent of the time in the U.S. and 47 percent of the time in Soviet Union. In grades nine through 12, the percentages were 41.9 and 26.8 percent respectively.¹¹

It should be obvious that these high percentages do not reflect any kind of meaningful political science training. It was assumed by many school districts, for example, that having students plant trees on Arbor Day, pick up litter on school grounds, pledge allegiance to the flag, or memorize the Gettysburg Address constituted valid "citizenship education."

Hess and Torney have reported that teachers of children in grades one through eight tended to focus on the importance of authority, obedience to law, and conformity to school regulations and to disregard the importance of participation.

Indeed, it seems likely that much of what is called citizenship training in the public schools does not teach about the city, state, or national government, but is an attempt to teach regard for the rules and standards of conduct of the school. If it does indeed characterize the school, this type of socialization

is oriented toward authoritarian values rather than toward acceptance and understanding of the need for active participation in a political system.¹²

Competent teachers could have provided instruction geared toward teaching participatory skills while operating under the first rationale if they were adequately prepared and wished to provide students with an understanding of political concepts. This is true because the first citizenship rationale seems to mean anything the school district personnel wished it to mean.

Teachers and/or school districts which operated using the second and third rationales would, however, have been more likely to help students achieve some political competence. Both of these rationales focused on government and governmental institutions, traditional domains of political science. Unfortunately, the two rationales were so broadly conceived that almost any objective might be construed appropriate to reach the general goal. In addition, curriculum materials that were available for civics, American government, and problems of democracy courses, where presumably such citizenship instruction might take place, were almost uniformly inadequate. Many educators also have suggested that the third rationale, focusing as it did on the negative aspects of our system, actually fostered cynicism and alienation rather than an understanding of the political system.¹³

All of the above rationales were operational in 1971 when political scientists and others assessed the quality of political education in the United States. Their assessments of what was going on in schools were devastating.

The social studies curriculum that made it possible for these rationales to be implemented was based on a course pattern that emerged in 1916, following the design recommended by the Committee on Social Studies of the National Commission on the Reorganization of Secondary Education of the National Education Association. The design included two cycles of study, one for grades seven through nine and the other for grades ten through 12. Civics replaced ancient history at the ninth grade. Community civics which wasn't to be started in grades seven or eight, was reemphasized and extended to include state, national, and world communities as well as the economic and vocational aspects of civics. The problems course in the twelfth grade was intended to develop intelligent and active citizens capable of dealing with vital social problems, which were of immediate interest to students. It should be remembered, however, that history courses continued to dominate the social studies curriculum in spite of the addition of these new political science components:

- Grade 7: European history (one semester geography optional)
- Grade 8: One semester American history, one semester civics
- Grade 9: One year civics, or civics and economic history
- Grade 10: European history
- Grade 11: American history and/or European history
- Grade 12: Problems of democracy (one or two semesters)

Course patterns during the 1960s were strikingly similar to the 1916 pattern. Most of the students' formal instruction in government occurred in American history courses, which were traditionally and almost universally taught at the fifth, eighth, and eleventh grades, and in the ninth-grade civics and twelfth-grade American government and/or problems of democracy courses.

Political science courses such as international relations and advanced civics were largely introduced and legitimized during the Depression and post-World War II years--the era of so-called progressive education. During this period the problems course was modified to reflect a more active student role--good citizenship through participation, problem solving, cooperating in social projects, and so on. In many areas, American history or Culture Studies had replaced European history at grade seven.

- Grade 7: American history, selected people and nations, geography, social studies
- Grade 8: American history, social studies
- Grade 9: Civics, occupational-vocational orientation, state history
- Grade 10: World history, modern history
- Grade 11: American history, social studies, electives--sociology, economics
- Grade 12: American government, problems of democracy, American history

In summary, on the preceding pages and the following tables, the typical curriculum patterns at the time are represented. In junior high and high school, the prevalent pattern was to teach social studies or geography in grade seven; American history in grade eight; civics in grade nine; world history in grade ten; American history in grade 11; and problems of democracy or American government in grade 12. Although the United States does not have a federally imposed curriculum, what was taught at the time in Boulder, Colorado, was also likely to be taught in Tuscaloosa, Alabama, Norfolk, Connecticut, and San Jose, California. Textbook publishers produced books for a national market on the assumption that most schools were following this pattern.

This is not to say that there were not regional differences, nor that the internal content of the courses was identical. State legislatures and state departments of education in the United States often, influence instruction to some extent.

The following tables give some indication of trends in social studies curricula during this era as well as total numbers of students or schools involved. Table I, which follows, indicates that in the ninth grade, the major offering was civics with about 25 percent of the schools offering geography. In grade 12, the percentage of schools offering government and problems of democracy was about equal to those offering economics, which indicates that these three subjects were the predominantly available electives. International relations fared poorly at all grade levels. One is compelled to hypothesize that the schools offering this subject must have had teachers with an interest in and commitment to the content.

TABLE I

Offerings and Enrollments in Grades 9-12 in Schools
Accredited by North Central Association: 1963¹⁴

Percent of schools offering in:

Course	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12	Percent of Schools not Responding*
Civics	40.2	4.6	--	--	60.4
World History	14.9	85.3	25.0	20.7	4.6
Geography	24.3	15.2	15.8	15.5	63.4
U.S. History	0.8	6.0	87.2	14.9	0.8
Government	--	--	10.9	50.3	48.9
Problems of Democracy	0.8	2.2	8.4	50.0	47.3
Economics	--	2.2	18.2	50.0	46.5
Sociology	0.3	1.6	8.2	14.7	84.2
International Relations	0.3	1.1	4.6	11.4	87.0

*Last column means that course is not offered. The total percentage for a course usually exceeds 100 because many schools allow a course (rows) to be taken by students in adjacent grade levels. The total percentage for grades 10-12 (columns) exceeds 100 because some schools offer a choice of courses at these levels.

TABLE II

Offerings and Enrollments in Grades 7-12 of
Public Secondary Schools by Subject: 1960-61¹⁵

Subject Field and Subject	Total	Pupils enrolled in:	
		Half-year courses	Full-year courses
SOCIAL STUDIES	11,802,499		
Grade 7	267,553	12,667	254,886
Grade 8	233,156	9,584	223,752
HISTORY, GRADES 7-8			
United States	1,695,956	118,497	1,557,459
State	651,790	183,200	468,590
World	324,947	33,598	291,349
CIVICS, GRADES 7-8	54,498	32,555	21,943
GEOGRAPHY, GRADES 7-8	1,045,069	206,335	838,734
SOCIAL STUDIES, GRADE 9	54,004	4,889	49,115
SOCIAL STUDIES, GRADE 10	8,653	1,317	7,436
OCCUPATIONS	82,216	50,275	31,941
ORIENTATION	87,124	44,475	42,649
CIVICS, GRADES 9-10	732,609	163,314	569,295
HISTORY, GRADES 9-12			
United States	1,994,068	26,978	1,957,090
State	374,517	182,688	191,829
World	1,471,531	41,192	1,430,339
Ancient/Medieval	103,960	26,666	77,294
Modern	75,108	14,542	60,566
Miscellaneous	11,908	6,438	5,470
WORLD GEOGRAPHY, GRADES 9-12	585,541	111,111	474,430
MISC. GEOGRAPHY, GRADES 9-12	9,609	2,183	7,426
CIVICS/GOVT., GRADES 11-12	780,123	343,423	436,700
PROBLEMS OF DEMOCRACY	380,453	95,056	285,397
ECONOMICS	293,175	217,401	75,774
PSYCHOLOGY	140,377	88,401	52,336
SOCIOLOGY/SOCIAL PROBS.	289,408	177,779	111,609
CONSUMER EDUCATION	30,245	14,489	15,756
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS	17,006	12,073	4,933
HONORS/ADVANCED PLACEMENT	3,223	842	2,281
MISC., GRADES 7-12	4,672	2,712	1,960

Total number of students enrolled in public junior or senior high schools
in 1960-61: 11,732,742.

Table II provides data for the school year 1960-61. It is apparent that : (1) the greatest enrollments in political science courses occurred in grades 11 and 12 when both American government and problems of democracy were available; (2) the ninth- and tenth-grade civics program accounted for the second highest enrollment; (3) the problems of democracy course was only about one-half as popular as either of the other two programs; and (4) international relations and seventh- and eighth-grade civics were behind in enrollment. In terms of full-year exposure, the ninth- and tenth-grade civics course outdistanced the eleventh and twelfth grade government/civics course, followed by problems of democracy, seventh/eighth grade civics, and international relations. When considering the exposure to half-year programs, the ordering changes with eleventh and twelfth grade government/civics outdistancing ninth-tenth civics.

It is also interesting to compare the civics/government/problems of democracy/international relations enrollments with history, geography, economics, sociology, and psychology. Only five percent as many seventh and eighth grade students were enrolled in civics as were enrolled in United States history. Both state and world history attracted more students at this level. The discrepancy between civics and geography enrollments is almost as marked. The data do not lend themselves to comparisons at the ninth-tenth grade level as all social studies courses except civics were categorized into nine-12 groupings. The same is true of data that might be compared to the eleventh-twelfth government/civics or problems of democracy courses. However, because world history was typically taught at grade ten and United States history at grade 11, one can hypothesize that government/civics was the most popular twelfth grade course. Problems of democracy, while more popular than economics, sociology, and psychology, did not evidence such a commanding lead.

Table III picks up totals provided on Table II, computes enrollment in terms of the percentage of grade enrollment, and compares these to enrollment in 1948-49. The figures are remarkably constant but underscore the relative decline of the problems course.

Unfortunately, data compiled for the 1970-71 school year (in Table IV) do not compare neatly with data for 1948-49 and 1960-61. For example, the percentage figures for pupils consist is of pupils enrolled in all secondary grades. A second difficulty comes with the different breakdown of courses. In Table IV, "Other political science" includes advanced political science, contemporary civilization, comparative systems, political theory, state governments, and contemporary American problems. The "Current events" category includes international relations and contemporary world affairs. Conceivably, courses called advanced political science might have been classified in the "Civics or government, grades 11-12" on the earlier tables. Certainly, contemporary American problems would have been subsumed in the "Problems of democracy" category.

Totals and percentages of total enrollment for the two years, while not as instructive, give some indication of the enrollment pattern in government-related courses, however. In 1960-61, 1,964,689, or

TABLE III

Number of Pupils Enrolled in Selected Subjects in Grades 9-12 with Percents. This number is of Total Enrollment in the Grades in which the Subject is Usually Offered: 1948-49; 1960-61⁶

Subject Field, Course and Usual Grade Level	1960-61		1948-49	
	Number of Pupils	Percent of Total Enrollment	Number of Pupils	Percent of Total Enrollment
SOCIAL STUDIES				
U.S. History (11)	1,994,068	104.3	1,231,694	99.2
World History (10)	1,471,531	69.4	896,432	58.9
Elementary Civics (9)	732,609	30.0	Not Available	
Advanced Civics (12)	780,123	44.7	431,916	42.1
Problems of Democracy (12)	380,453	21.8	282,971	27.6
Economics (12)	293,175	16.8	254,770	24.8
Psychology (12)	140,337	8.0	46,547	4.5
Sociology/Social Problems (12)	289,468	16.6	185,901	18.1
Total enrollment (1960):	Grade 9--2,441,668; Grade 10--2,119,393 Grade 11--1,912,465; Grade 12--1,745,750			
Total enrollment (1948):	Grade 9--1,641,406; Grade 10--1,490,678 Grade 11--1,241,505; Grade 12--1,025,913			

TABLE IV

Number and Percent of Public Secondary Schools Offering Specified Courses and Pupils Enrolled in Such Courses with Percents. This Number is of Total Enrollment, 1970-71¹⁷

Subject Area & Course	Schools Offering Courses		Pupils Enrolled	
	Number	Percent of Total	Number	Percent of total
U.S. History, 7-8	9,365	35.6	1,705,285	9.3
U.S. History, 9-12	14,168	56.2	3,064,401	16.7
World History, 7-8	2,614	9.9	435,525	2.4
World History, 9-12	13,597	51.7	1,699,041	9.2
State History, 7-8	5,797	22.1	850,197	4.6
State History, 9-12	3,036	11.6	292,775	1.6
American History and World Backgrounds	3,656	13.9	568,527	3.1
Black History (U.S.)	937	3.6	136,668	0.7
Other History	4,408	16.8	565,673	3.6
American Studies	1,579	6.0	269,435	1.5
Asian & African Studies	1,488	5.7	269,855	1.5
World Cultures	1,289	4.9	346,293	1.9
Geography, 7-8	3,406	13.2	771,069	4.2
Human/Cultural Geography	1,453	5.5	165,442	0.9
World/Global Geography	9,880	37.6	1,028,461	5.6
U.S. Government	11,768	44.8	1,643,202	8.9
Community Civics	5,492	20.9	615,034	3.3
Current Events	3,834	14.6	305,098	1.7
Problems of Democracy	3,729	14.2	227,448	1.2
Other Political Science	2,710	8.3	168,886	0.9
Social Studies, 7	3,859	14.7	628,621	3.4
Social Studies, 8	4,147	15.8	804,133	4.4
Social Studies, 9	1,800	6.8	319,670	1.7
Anthropology	891	3.4	130,351	0.7
Economics	10,296	39.4	782,923	4.3
Environmental Problems	181	0.7	8,844	0.1
Psychology	5,779	22.0	508,792	2.8
Sociology	8,734	33.2	797,533	4.3
All Other Social Sciences	4,358	16.6	459,568	2.5

Total number of students enrolled in public junior and senior high schools in 1970-71: 18,406,617

approximately 17 percent of all students, were enrolled in these programs, while in 1970-71, 2,959,668, or approximately 16 percent, were enrolled.

Perhaps the most notable developments in course offerings and enrollments during the decade, according to the 1970-71 data, were: (1) the greater variety of courses offered, (2) the extent to which advanced or college-level courses were available to pupils in high school, and (3) the offering of traditional upper-level high school courses to younger pupils. Another finding was that a multiplicity of short courses had been introduced into the curriculum. The average number of courses per pupil rose from 6.4 percent in 1960-61 to 7.1 percent in 1970-71.

As interesting or as obfuscating as course patterns might be, an analysis of the content of these courses may serve to better illuminate what was actually being taught in the 1960s in these courses.

Farnen and Bjork used a simple frequency analysis of major subject areas found in representative statements of teaching goals, curriculum guides, government texts, and new and experimental curricula to generate the following as the most frequently found categories:

1. Basic interests and values (e.g., toleration, reasoned patriotism, dignity and worth of the individual, social consciousness).
2. Basic political understandings (e.g., nature of politics, freedom versus license, equality of opportunity).
3. Respect for individualism (e.g., autonomy, compromise, pluralism).
4. Basic citizenship, terminology and vocabulary (e.g., terms such as popular sovereignty, democracy, majority rule).
5. Critical thinking and judgment (e.g., problem solving, social scientific method and attitude propaganda analysis).
6. Sociological and psychological factors (e.g., social change, role status, power).
7. Group factors (e.g., group participation, civic action, rules of order).
8. The family (e.g., loyalty, economic units, recreation, problem solving).
9. Social problem solving (e.g., recognize racial, economic, and other problems and proposed solutions and evaluate results).
10. Economic factors (e.g., economic efficiency, conservation, collective bargaining, consumership).
11. Foreign, international, and intercultural problems (e.g., war and peace, realization of vital national interests, armaments).¹⁸

These were the givens, the content of social studies and political education. The context, what was going on outside the schools at the time, is equally important to understand. There was tremendous public concern over the quality of education.

Criticisms of Education Leading to Reform

The criticisms of educational programming during the 1950s that

eventually led to the "new social studies" were not directed particularly against political education. The attack was on the entire educational establishment--the curricula and the educators involved. Unlike other "calls for reform" which, in the past, had been largely initiated by academics and professional associations, the onslaught came primarily from the outside. In 1955, Rudolph Flesch published a smashing indictment of public education entitled Why Johnny Can't Read: And What You Can Do About It. In the same year, journalist Douglas Bush, writing in the New York Times Magazine, struck out about the decline in foreign language instruction. Senator William Benton, also writing in the New York Times Magazine, began comparing U.S. schools unfavorably to those in the U.S.S.R. John Haas captured the spirit of the era:

There were many facets to the critique of public education in the United States in 1955. In the domain of the school curriculum [that is, the content and methods of instruction], the attack focused on the subjects of reading, foreign language, mathematics, and science and the teaching methods advocated in the ideologies of 'progressive education' and 'life adjustment education.'¹⁹

It was not long before academics (as opposed to methods professors, for example) joined the fray. The general tenor of their remarks emphasized a return to the disciplines, more rigorous standards, and pursuit of intellectualism for its own sake. It is important to note that during this period not much was said about political education per se. If citizenship was thought of at all, it was in the context of the perspective that an "analytical citizen, well versed in the content and methodologies of the disciplines will be a better citizen."

Then, there came Sputnik in 1957, which in the minds of the critics provided additional and concrete evidence that American education had to be radically restructured. It is not my intent to trace how the reform movement shaped up. Suffice it to say, it began in mathematics and science and the approaches and pedagogical assumptions developed in these areas of the general curriculum were eventually incorporated into all subject areas during the period 1957 to 1969. Haas outlines the underlying assumptions as follows:

1. That there is a need to change the content, materials, and methods of instruction in the subject;
2. That the most crucial focus in improving instruction and learning is the student textbook or learning materials;
3. That directors of projects should be drawn from the academic disciplines, though teachers, school administrators, and education professors are acceptable as project staff members or consultants;
4. That the prestige of project sponsors and/or directors is crucial to legitimization of curriculum projects;
5. That curricular reform in particular subjects should begin where those subjects are manifested as discrete courses, that is, in the high school;

6. That the improvement of courses for the academically talented and gifted is more crucial to the national interest than general education courses;
7. That the integrity of the academic disciplines must be an overriding concern at all educational levels;
8. That the essence of a discipline of knowledge is in its structure, that is, in its models, theories, concepts, generalizations, methodologies, and applications;
9. That learning by discovery or inquiry enhances motivation and transfer of learning;
10. That the cognitive, intellectual dimension of learning is a more appropriate focus in schools than the affective and personal/social action dimensions;
11. That in-service education is necessary to effective use of new curriculum projects and should be balanced among new content, new pedagogy, and new materials;
12. That curriculum product development is an experimental process involving development of a rationale, deciding on format and learning sequence, writing segments, field-testing in schools, revising, producing teacher aids based on empirical classroom observations, diffusing product information, and publishing final products; and
13. That considerable time and money are required for curriculum product development.²⁰

It is tempting at this point to discuss how the social scientists and social studies educators mobilized to change American schools. There were conferences and papers prepared by eminent academics who had never before gotten so intensely involved in pre-collegiate education efforts. In retrospect, it seems fair to say that a part of the response had to do with a real concern about the overall quality of American education and a part with a more pragmatic consideration. The United States government was beginning to pump millions of dollars into the effort to improve the schools.

In any event, by 1961, three new social studies projects had been launched. A year later there were seven. Before the heyday was over at least 135 projects had geared up to do "something." Suzanne Helburn believes that, of this number, 31 achieved national prominence and are the ones most people associate with the term new social studies.²¹

Political Education in the New Social Studies

Out of the totality of social science curriculum packages that were developed during the 1960s by the various nationally funded curriculum development projects, there were wide variations among those that had political content. In general, it can be said that the developers of these materials attempted to select and organize their content in terms of the fundamental concepts, propositions, and questions that structure the inquiries of scholars in the social sciences and humanities. In other words, they tended to employ conceptual frameworks in order to facilitate student comprehension of relationships between information and ideas.

It also seems to be true that most of the new curricula tended to be more realistic, relevant, and interesting than traditional materials. Controversial issues, conflict, and conflict management were examined. Of critical importance is the fact that competing values and viewpoints were explored and analyzed. The scientific mode of inquiry was regularly used and students were encouraged to question, collect data, hypothesize, test their hypotheses, draw inferences, and make tentative generalizations. A vast array of social science skills--such as classification, categorization, model building, and data processing--were also taught to enhance the analytical abilities of students.

Of course, the materials varied in scope, level of generality, and quality. Some of the projects produced only a few units, while others generated extensive sets of materials, up to complete K-12 curricula. Some of the projects dealt primarily with individual disciplines in the social sciences; others drew upon many or all of the social sciences. Some of the materials were primarily designed for sequential and cumulative use, while others were developed to "plug into" traditional courses to enrich and supplement them. Some resources were developed for abler students, others specifically for average or for disadvantaged youth.

Materials that had significant political science content can be classified into five categories: those emphasizing (1) interdisciplinary or multidisciplinary approaches to the social sciences, (2) a particular discipline other than political science, (3) particular geographic areas, (4) political science, and (5) law and its role in society.

Inter/Multidisciplinary Materials. The materials in this group are quite varied, but are characterized by the fact that content from a number of the social sciences was used, without emphasis on any one. In general, the developers accepted the notion that common concepts, methodological techniques, and levels of analysis from all the social sciences can usefully be acquired by students.

Within the group, there were two divergent approaches. The first emphasized the concepts and methods of the social sciences; the second focused on social and political controversies and the values that underlie them, with the social sciences, as such, playing a minor role.

Examples of curricula that most clearly represented the first point of view are:

Carnegie-Mellon University. The Humanities in Three Cities. Edwin Fenton, Director. Grades 9-12. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Education Development Center. From Subject to Citizen. Peter Dow, Director. Grades 7-12. Denoyer-Geppert Company.

Educational Research Council of America. Concepts and Inquiry. Raymond English, Director. Grades K-9. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

San Francisco State College. Taba Program in Social Science. Mary C. Durkin, et al., Directors. Grades 1-8. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Project materials that most clearly reflected the second view are:

Harvard University. Public Issues Series. Fred M. Newmann and Donald W. Oliver, Directors. Grades 7-12. American Education Publications.

Utah State University. Decision Making in a Democracy. James P. Shaver and A. Guy Larkins, Directors. Grades 9-12. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Project Materials Using a Single Discipline (Except Political Science) as Organizer of Social Science Concepts. A second approach to organization was to use the generalizations and methodologies of one discipline to give direction to the explanation and use of concepts from a number of disciplines. Ridgway F. Shinn, Jr., for instance, suggested that although the viewpoints and methodologies of history and geography are distinct, they are in some sense integrative in nature. Either could, therefore, provide the curricular framework within which it would be possible to relate concepts from other disciplines in a meaningful way. Edith West of the University of Minnesota, after determining the terrain of each of the social sciences disciplines, the types of questions asked by practitioners of the discipline, the conceptual theories, and the methods of inquiry, chose concepts from anthropology as the organizers for a K-12 curriculum.

Economics, geography, history, social psychology, and sociology were also used in similar ways. Examples are:

Anthropology

University of Georgia. Anthropology Curriculum Project. Marion J. Rice and Wilfrid C. Bailey, Directors. K-12 Project.

Economics

San Jose State College. Economics in Society. Suzanne Wiggins Helburn and John G. Sperling, Directors. Grades 9-14. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Carnegie-Mellon University. Comparative Economic Systems. Edwin Fenton, Director. Grades 10-12. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Geography

Association of American Geographers. Geography in an Urban Age and The Local Community: A Handbook for Teachers. Nicholas Helburn, Director. Grades 7-14. The Macmillan Company.

History

Amherst Project. Units in American History. Richard H. Brown, Director. Grades 9-12. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Carnegie-Mellon University. The Shaping of Western Society, Tradition and Change in Four Societies, A History of the United States, and The Americans: A History of the United States. Edwin Fenton, Director. Grades 8-12. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Psychology

University of Michigan. Social Science Laboratory Units. Robert S. Fox and Ronald Lippitt, Directors. Grades 4-8. Science Research Associates, Inc.

Sociology

American Sociological Association. Episodes in Sociology Series, Inquiries in Sociology, and Readings in Sociology. Robert C. Angell, Director. Grades 9-12. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Carnegie-Mellon University. Introduction to the Behavioral Sciences. Edwin Fenton, Director. Grades 9-12. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

Area Studies. Beyond the obvious desirability of enhancing students' understanding of a variety of cultures, areas, and regions, curriculum developers suggested two main reasons for this kind of focus. First, the study of other cultures offers a rich variety of views of man. Second, such study gives students practice in applying to another milieu such universal concepts as the nature of man, progress, man's relation to environment, and the purposes of government. Examples of materials in which the political science content was organized by region or area:

University of California at Berkeley. Asian Studies Inquiry Series. John U. Michaelis and Robin J. McKeown, Directors. Grades 9-12. Field Educational Publications, Inc.

University of California at Berkeley. World Studies Inquiry Series. Robin J. McKeown, Director. Grades 7-12. Field Educational Publications, Inc.

Materials with Primary Focus on Political Science Content. Examples of materials packages in which political science provided most of the content are:

University of California at Los Angeles. Your Rights and Responsibilities as an American Citizen; Conflict, Politics, and Freedom; and Voices for Justice. Richard P. Longaker and Charles N. Quigley, Directors. Grades 4-12. Ginn and Company.

Carnegie-Mellon University. Comparative Political Systems. Edwin Fenton, Director. Grades 9-12. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.

University of Indiana. American Political Behavior. Howard Mehlinger and John J. Patrick, Directors. Grades 9-12. Ginn and Company.

Tufts University. Lincoln Filene Center Social Studies Program. John S. Gibson, Director. Grades 4-12. Project.

Although the content foci of the above curricula were primarily drawn from political science, each curriculum employed a different approach to organizing that content. For instance, Comparative Political Systems used a conceptual scheme stressing five main concepts--political decision makers, political decision making, political institutions, political culture, and citizenship--to structure the inquiry of students.

The authors of American Political Behavior structured such basic behavioral science concepts as culture, socialization, status, role, social class, and decision making into a logical and systematic framework; translated them into terms high school students could understand; and provided opportunity for practice in their proper use by suggesting investigations through which the concepts are made operational.

The Longaker-Quigley materials--Your Rights and Responsibilities as an American Citizen; Conflict, Politics, and Freedom; and Voices for Justice--were designed to increase students' grasp of the fundamental principles of democratic procedure and assist them in analyzing underlying values and assumptions when dealing with the realities of political and social life.

The Lincoln Filene Center Social Studies Program utilized a "governing process model" with which to make political phenomena intelligible to elementary and non-college-bound secondary students. The basic components of the governing process were, according to the model: the people, or the governed; the officials, or the governors; the political process; the structure of government; decision making; policy; and policies of external politics.

Law-Related Materials. Generally, these programs sought to demonstrate the functions, techniques, processes, and limits of law on the premise that such a study is a particularly effective way of teaching major goals and objectives of political science education. A second premise of the law programs seemed to be that

studying about the law brings to social studies a body of learning that is itself of distinctive value to general education--a body of learning without which the study of political and social ordering would be somewhat deficient.²²

Yet a third premise was explicated by Paul A. Freund in an article in Social Education. He noted that a facility for moral reasoning, which may carry over into all aspects of life, can successfully be taught with law materials.²³

Examples of materials with content focus on political science and law are:

Constitutional Rights Foundation. The Bill of Rights: A Handbook for Teachers and The Bill of Rights: A Sourcebook for Teachers. Vivian Monroe, Director. Grades 6-12. Benziger Brothers.

Cornell University. The American Legal System and Justice and Order Through Law. Robert F. Summers and A. Bruce Campbell, Directors. Grades 7-12. Ginn and Company.

Law in American Society Foundation. Justice in America and The Trailmakers Series. Robert H. Radcliffe, Director. Grades 7-12. Houghton Mifflin Company.

Reactions, Impact, and Utilization of the New Materials

The new products were hardly beyond the conceptualization stage when some academicians began to have second thoughts about quality and ideas about possible new directions. Early on, there were those who questioned the heavy cognitive orientation of the new social studies. Some discerned that cognition would not be a likely result without an equal emphasis on affect. In fact, many materials produced later in the developmental cycle reflected this concern.

At the same time, the "structures of the disciplines" notion came under fire. Many reported, and rightly so, that several of the disciplines (e.g., political science) have not evolved to the point where a conceptual structure could be articulated. In the case of political science, the professionals had difficulty in obtaining agreement on which of the discipline concepts and generalizations would be most useful to teach.

Other critics hit at perhaps an even more troublesome problem with the "structures" approach, because it focused on the question, "What is the purpose of political education?" If political education is perceived to be needed to: (1) train mini-political scientists; (2) produce students capable of reasoned, dispassionate analysis of political phenomena; (3) ready students for either political service or college, then the "structures" approach makes some sense. If, on the other hand, the purpose of political education is to: (1) build general support for the political system; (2) produce students who are not only capable but also eager to participate in the system; and (3) provide opportunities for value clarifying and developing skills of moral and ethical analysis, then "structures" would not do.

Donald Oliver and James Shaver, for example, conceptualized their rationale which, although it was developed concurrently, was almost a reaction to the "structures" rationales. For both Oliver and Shaver, the social sciences per se did not offer appropriate conceptual frameworks with which to help students think reflectively. The Oliver and Shaver model proposed answers to some of

the questions noted above (e.g., the main goals of political education should be to teach analytical skills that enable one to think about and "know" about public issues). On the other hand, in spite of the fact that their approach was cognitive and intellectual, it offered no assistance in improving political science education.

For others, even a commitment to cognitive "valuing" was disturbing because they believed that value clarification rested as much (or more) on an affective as on a cognitive base. These people noted that in addition to helping students define their values and be able to justify them both logically and morally, it was equally important for the teachers and program developers to devise strategies and procedures to help students increase their ability to empathize with others from a wide variety of different cultures and backgrounds. In other words, it was felt that the ability to empathize was basic if students were to understand, although not necessarily accept or agree with, values different from their own or those of their parents or peers.²⁴

John Patrick suggested another problem with the new curricula, this one having to do with inquiry oriented programs. All of these programs included objectives which stressed skills such as analyzing, hypothesizing, verifying, generalizing, and so on--skills of critical thinking. At the same time, they stated that students would be better citizens and more likely to participate as a result of interacting with the materials.

Some political educators have not understood that teaching students to be competent critical thinkers and inquirers logically precludes their positing various fixed attitudinal outcomes. Consistent advocates of teaching skill in and affect for critical thinking have only one absolute, which is the process of inquiry. Other attitudinal outcomes of this process cannot be fixed, if one is to teach the process properly. As A. F. Griffin said:

'Reflection cannot guarantee that attitude will change in a particular direction. The attempt to promote specific changes in attitude would, of course, be undemocratic since it would require a rejection of reflective thought as the sole basis for conceptual thinking.'²⁵

Did the new social studies materials make a difference or have an impact on the general curriculum in the United States? If one's criterion is, "did they sell?" the answer is no. With few exceptions the texts, media packages, resource booklets, and so on were a commercial flop. Turner and Haley and others conducting utilization studies found they made their greatest impact in middle-class and upper-middle-class suburban school districts--those that had the most resources with which to buy, had large numbers of well-trained teachers or teachers who were committed enough to professionalism that they would attend training institutes, and had training in active citizenship as an instructional goal.²⁶

If the question is, "did anything change?" the answer is yes. Commercially published textbooks changed in appearance and became more attractive. Teaching strategies and inquiry activities were

incorporated into these texts. The behavior of many teachers changed, as well, as they moved from lecture to more of a discussion mode.

There is certainly not a one-to-one relationship between quality of materials and extent of use. Many factors entered in in addition to the inherent problems referred to above. The developers did not take into consideration how to achieve institutional and educational change. The materials did not deal with the social complexities of the time--the racial difficulties, the war in Vietnam, the assassinations of national leaders--in a way that was helpful to students. Ultimate success was also challenged by the back-to-basics movement of the 1970s, in which social studies was not usually defined as basic. This was an extraordinary development in a country in which the education of its citizens had been historically worthy of support as the basic purpose of social studies education. All of these are issues for another time and another paper.

ENDNOTES

- 1 Robert D. Barr, James L. Barth, and Samuel Shermis, Defining the Social Studies. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977, p.1.
- 2 Rolla Tyron, The Social Sciences as School Subjects, Part XI: Report of the Commission on Social Studies. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1935, p. 402.
- 3 Development theorists have further confused the issue of citizenship education by raising questions about when such instruction should be provided. See for example, James S. Eckenrod, "Thinking About Interdependence, Conflict, Communication, and Change" in Global Perspectives: A Humanistic Influence on the Curriculum. New York: Center for Global Perspectives, 1976.
- 4 "Characteristics of the Good Democratic Citizen" in Ryland W. Crary, ed., Education for Democratic Citizenship. Washington, D.C.: Twenty-Second Yearbook, National Council for the Social Studies, 1951, p.156.
- 5 National Assessment of Educational Progress, Citizenship Objectives. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education, 1969.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Russell F. Farnen and Robert M. Bjork, The Teaching of Government. Nashville, Tennessee: George Peabody College for Teachers. Unpublished paper, 2nd., pp. 2-3.
- 8 Randall C. Anderson, Current Trends in Secondary School Social Studies. Lincoln, Nebraska: Professional Educators Publications, Inc., 1972, p. 15.
- 9 Ibid., p. 16.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 George A. F. Bereday and Bonnie B. Stretch, "Political Education in the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R.," in Comparative Education Review, Vol. 7, No. 1, June 1963, pp. 1-16.
- 12 Robert D. Hess and Judith V. Tonney, The Development of Basic Attitudes and Values Toward Government and Citizenship During the Elementary School Years. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Report of Project No. 1078 of USOE, 1965, p.372.

- 13 Anderson, op. cit., p. 16.
- 14 Bertram A. Masia, "Profile of Current Secondary School Social Studies Curriculum in North Central Association Schools" in The North Central Association Quarterly, Vol. 38, No. 2, 1963, p. 207.
- 15 Grace S. Wright, Summary of Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, p. 100.
- 16 Grace S. Wright, Subject Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1965, p. 100.
- 17 Diane B. Gertlin and Linda A. Barker, Patterns of Course Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools. Washington, D.C.: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1972, pp. 10-12.
- 18 Farnen and Bjork, op. cit., pp. 11-12. This survey was conducted by Farnen in 1967 in conjunction with the ETS participation in the citizenship assessment of the Committee on Assessing the Progress of Education (CAPE).
- 19 John D. Haas, The Era of the New Social Studies. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977, p. 3.
- 20 Ibid., pp. 13-14.
- 21 Suzanne W. Helburn, "The Status of the Social Studies Curriculum and the Potential for Reform" in Social/Political Education in Three Countries. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1981, p. 187.
- 22 A. Bruce Campbell, personal letter dated June 4, 1973.
- 23 Paul A. Freund, "Law in the Schools: Goals and Methods" in Social Education, Vol. 37, No. 5, May 1973, pp. 363-367.
- 24 See for example, Louis E. Rath, Merrill Harmon, and Sidney B. Simon, Values and Teaching. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill, 1966.
- 25 John J. Patrick, "Main Themes in Political Education." Unpublished paper prepared for a conference on political education in the Federal Republic of Germany and the United States at Indiana University. Bloomington, Indiana: September 15-19, 1975, p.4.
- 26 Mary Jane Turner and Frances Haley, "Utilization of 'New Social Studies' Curriculum Programs" in Three Studies on Perception and Utilization of "New Social Studies" Materials. Boulder, Colorado: Social Science Education Consortium, Inc., 1977.